



- <sup>8</sup>Institut d'Astrophysique et de Géophysique, University of Liege, Liege, Belgium  
<sup>9</sup>Service d'Aéronomie/IPSL, CNRS-Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France  
<sup>10</sup>University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia  
<sup>11</sup>University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada  
<sup>12</sup>CETEMPS, Università di L'Aquila, Dipartimento di Fisica, L'Aquila, Italy  
<sup>13</sup>Institute of Atmospheric Physics, CAS, Beijing, China  
<sup>14</sup>Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Table Mountain Facility, Wrightwood, CA, USA  
<sup>15</sup>National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, RIVM – LVM, Bilthoven, The Netherlands  
<sup>16</sup>University of Oxford, Oxford, UK  
<sup>17</sup>CCLRC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (RAL), UK  
<sup>18</sup>University of Leicester, Leicester, UK  
<sup>19</sup>National Institute for Water and Air Research Ltd., Lauder, New Zealand  
<sup>20</sup>University of Athens, Faculty of Physics, Dept of Applied Physics, Greece

Received: 29 March 2007 – Accepted: 29 March 2007 – Published: 7 May 2007

Correspondence to: U. Cortesi (u.cortesi@ifac.cnr.it)

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

The Michelson Interferometer for Passive Atmospheric Sounding (MIPAS), on-board the European ENVironmental SATellite (ENVISAT) launched on 1 March 2002, is a middle infrared Fourier Transform spectrometer measuring the atmospheric emission spectrum in limb sounding geometry. The instrument is capable to retrieve the vertical distribution of temperature and trace gases, aiming at the study of climate and atmospheric chemistry and dynamics, and at applications to data assimilation and weather forecasting. MIPAS operated in its standard observation mode for approximately two years, from July 2002 to March 2004, with scans performed at nominal spectral resolution of  $0.025\text{ cm}^{-1}$  and covering the altitude range from the mesosphere to the upper troposphere with relatively high vertical resolution (about 3 km in the stratosphere). Only reduced spectral resolution measurements have been performed subsequently. MIPAS data were re-processed by ESA using updated versions of the Instrument Processing Facility (IPF v4.61 and v4.62) and provided a complete set of level-2 operational products (geo-located vertical profiles of temperature and volume mixing ratio of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{HNO}_3$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{NO}_2$ ) with quasi continuous and global coverage in the period of MIPAS full spectral resolution mission. In this paper, we report a detailed description of the validation of MIPAS-ENVISAT operational ozone data, that was based on the comparison between MIPAS v4.61 (and, to a lesser extent, v4.62)  $\text{O}_3$  VMR profiles and a comprehensive set of correlative data, including observations from ozone sondes, ground-based lidar, FTIR and microwave radiometers, remote-sensing and in situ instruments on-board stratospheric aircraft and balloons, concurrent satellite sensors and ozone fields assimilated by the European Center for Medium-range Weather Forecasting.

A coordinated effort was carried out, using common criteria for the selection of individual validation data sets, and similar methods for the comparisons. This enabled merging the individual results from a variety of independent reference measurements of proven quality (i.e., well characterised error budget) into an overall evaluation of

## MIPAS ozone validation

U. Cortesi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1 I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> data quality, having both statistical strength and the widest spatial and temporal coverage. Collocated measurements from ozone sondes and ground-based lidar and microwave radiometers of the Network for Detection Atmospheric Composition Change (NDACC) were selected to carry out comparisons with time series of MIPAS

5 O<sub>3</sub> partial columns and to identify groups of stations and time periods with a uniform pattern of ozone differences, that were subsequently used for a vertically resolved statistical analysis. The results of the comparison are classified according to synoptic and regional systems and to altitude intervals, showing a generally good agreement within the comparison error bars in the upper and middle stratosphere. Significant differences  
10 emerge in the lower stratosphere and are only partly explained by the larger contributions of horizontal and vertical smoothing differences and of collocation errors to the total uncertainty. Further results obtained from a purely statistical analysis of the same data set from NDACC ground-based lidar stations, as well as from additional ozone soundings at middle latitudes and from NDACC ground-based FTIR measurements, confirm the validity of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> profiles down to the lower stratosphere, with evidence  
15 of larger discrepancies at the lowest altitudes. The validation against O<sub>3</sub> VMR profiles using collocated observations performed by other satellite sensors (SAGE II, POAM III, ODIN-SMR, ACE-FTS, HALOE, GOME) and ECMWF assimilated ozone fields leads to consistent results, that are to a great extent compatible with those obtained from the comparison with ground-based measurements. Excellent agreement in the full vertical  
20 range of the comparison is shown with respect to collocated ozone data from stratospheric aircraft and balloon instruments, that was mostly obtained in very good spatial and temporal coincidence with MIPAS scans. This might suggest that the larger differences observed in the upper troposphere and lowermost stratosphere with respect  
25 to collocated ground-based and satellite O<sub>3</sub> data are only partly due to a degradation of MIPAS data quality. They should be rather largely ascribed to the natural variability of these altitude regions and to other components of the comparison errors. By combining the results of this large number of validation data sets we derived a general assessment of MIPAS v4.61 and v4.62 ozone data quality.

---

MIPAS ozone  
validation

U. Cortesi et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

A clear indication of the validity of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> vertical profiles is obtained for most of the stratosphere, where the mean relative difference with the individual correlative data sets is always lower than  $\pm 10\%$ . Furthermore, these differences always fall within the combined systematic error (from 1 hPa to 50 hPa) and the standard deviation is fully consistent with the random error of the comparison (from 1 hPa to  $\sim 30\text{--}40$  hPa). A degradation in the quality of the agreement is generally observed in the lower stratosphere and upper troposphere, with biases up to 25% at 100 hPa and standard deviation of the global mean differences up to three times larger than the combined random error in the range 50–100 hPa. The larger differences observed at the bottom end of MIPAS retrieved profiles can be associated, as already noticed, to the effects of stronger atmospheric gradients in the UTLS that are perceived differently by the various measurement techniques. However, further components that may degrade the results of the comparison at lower altitudes can be identified as potentially including cloud contamination, which is likely not to have been fully filtered using the current settings of the MIPAS cloud detection algorithm, and in the linear approximation of the forward model that was used for the climatological estimate of systematic error components. The latter, when affecting systematic contributions with a random variability over the spatial and temporal scales of global averages, might result in an underestimation of the random error of the comparison and add up to other error sources, such as the possible underestimates of the  $p$  and  $T$  error propagation based on the assumption of a 1 K and 2% uncertainties, respectively, on MIPAS temperature and pressure retrievals.

At pressure lower than 1 hPa, only a small fraction of the selected validation data set provides correlative ozone data of adequate quality and it is difficult to derive quantitative conclusions about the performance of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> retrieval for the topmost layers.

## 1 Introduction

Ozone is one of the six atmospheric trace gases (H<sub>2</sub>O, O<sub>3</sub>, HNO<sub>3</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and NO<sub>2</sub>) that, along with temperature, constitute the set of target products of the Michel-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1

1

2

1

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

son Interferometer for Passive Atmospheric Sounding (MIPAS) on-board the European ENVironment SATellite (ENVISAT) (Fischer and Oelhaf, 1996) and plays a pivotal role in the majority of the research areas covered by the scientific mission of the instrument (Fischer et al., 1990). The need for global and continuous monitoring of ozone total column and vertical distribution is primarily linked to its absorption properties in the ultraviolet, that prevent biologically harmful UV radiation from reaching the lower atmosphere and the Earth's surface, and to its impact as a radiatively active gas, that strongly influences the atmospheric heating rates. The former are, in fact, responsible for the protective action of the ozonosphere, that has been severely reduced by ozone depletion at high latitudes and whose recovery can be anticipated only by reliable projections which solve the existing uncertainties on the complex interactions between stratospheric gas-phase and heterogeneous chemistry and dynamics (Solomon, 1999; Von del Gathen et al., 1995). The second is evident, first of all, throughout the mutual influence between natural variability and anthropogenic forcing on ozone concentration on one side and the alterations of the temperature profile on the other, that represents one of the most important feedbacks between atmospheric chemistry and climate (Pyle et al., 2005). The ozone levels and their greenhouse effect are especially relevant at the boundary between the upper troposphere and the lower stratosphere (UTLS region), where they take part in the control of stratospheric-tropospheric exchange, that in turn drives the long-term trends of tropospheric ozone budget and potentially alters the oxidizing capacity and the level of pollution of lower atmospheric layers.

Moreover, several questions related to the chemistry and transport and to the energy budget of the upper atmosphere are still open and demand a more accurate knowledge of the ozone distribution in conditions of local thermodynamic disequilibrium, e.g. the problem of the ozone deficit in the upper stratosphere and lower mesosphere and the investigation of O<sub>3</sub> non-LTE (non local thermal equilibrium) emission (Crutzen et al., 1995). New insight into all of these aspects can be gained by exploiting MIPAS ozone and ozone-related species measurement capabilities, which are optimally suited to cover the full altitude range from the lower thermosphere down to the UTLS.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

A crucial step towards the exploitation of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> operational products in quantitative studies investigating the above mentioned science issues is, however, a thorough validation process, based on comparison with a comprehensive suite of correlative data sets and capable of deriving an overall assessment of the reliability and quality of MIPAS ozone measurements. This aim has been accomplished – for the set of ozone data obtained by MIPAS during the period from 6 July 2002 to 2 March 2004 (i.e. during the instrument nominal spectral resolution mission, see Sect. 2) – throughout a series of dedicated experiments executed by different teams and providing results that were subsequently combined into a general and consistent picture.

The present paper represents the final outcome of this activity, that involved scientists from the sub-groups of the ENVISAT Atmospheric Chemistry Validation Team (ACVT) contributing to the geophysical validation of MIPAS ozone profiles, i.e. the GBMCD (Ground-Based Measurements and Campaign Database), the ESABC (ENVISAT Stratospheric Aircraft and Balloon Campaigns) and the MASI (Model Assimilation and Satellite Intercomparison) sub-groups. The activity started three months after the ENVISAT launch (1 March 2002) with the calibration and validation experiments of the Commissioning Phase and continued during the 12 months of the Main Validation Phase (1 September 2002 to 1 September 2003) and the first part of the Long-term Validation Programme. Preliminary results of the geophysical validation of MIPAS ozone measurements were presented during the First and the Second ENVISAT Validation Workshop held at ESA's European Space Research INstitute (ESA-ESRIN, Frascati, Italy), respectively in December 2002 and May 2004. A first attempt was made there to achieve a quantitative evaluation of the quality of MIPAS near real-time and off-line O<sub>3</sub> data products, by combining the results of comparisons with ozone sonde, lidar and microwave measurements from individual ground-based stations and networks (Blumenstock et al., 2004), with remote-sensing and in situ observations from balloon and aircraft field campaigns (Cortesi et al., 2004), as well as with profiles from concurrent satellite sensors (Kerridge et al., 2004). As a further and closing step in the process of gradual merging and integration of individual validation results, we finally

MIPAS ozone  
validation

U. Cortesi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

conducted a coordinated effort, focussing on MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> data versions v4.61 and v4.62, to homogenise criteria and strategies of the comparison with different correlative data sets and to update the pre-launch estimates of precision and accuracy of the selected MIPAS ozone products.

5 An overview of the latter phase, with presentation of final results and conclusions, is given in the following sections. In Sect. 2, we briefly revisit some basic information about MIPAS operational ozone data, whilst in Sect. 3 we provide general remarks on the choice of the ozone validation data set and strategy. Sections 4, 5 and 6 are devoted to detailed description of the methodology and results of the validation against  
10 ground-based, airborne and satellite ozone measurements, respectively. Comparisons between MIPAS and ECMWF (European Center for Medium-range Weather Forecasting) ozone profiles are presented in Sect. 7. A summary of the results from the different categories of correlative measurements is discussed in Sect. 8 and final conclusions about the quality of MIPAS ozone retrieval are presented in Sect. 9.

## 15 2 MIPAS ozone data

MIPAS is a middle infrared Fourier transform spectrometer operating on-board the ENVISAT platform and acquiring high resolution spectra of atmospheric limb emission in  
20 ve spectral bands within the frequency range from 685 to 2410 cm<sup>-1</sup> (14.6 to 4.15 μm) (Fischer et al. 2007<sup>1</sup>). Launched on the sun-synchronous polar orbit of the satellite with an inclination of 98.55° and at an altitude of 800 km, MIPAS performed quasi-continuous measurements at nominal spectral resolution ( $\Delta\sigma=0.025$  cm<sup>-1</sup>, defined as the spacing between independent spectral elements of the unpodized spectrum and

<sup>1</sup>Fischer, H., Birk, M., Blom, C. E., Carli, B., Carlotti, M., von Clarmann, T., Delbouille, L., Dudhia, A., Ehret, D., Endemann, M., Flaud, J.-M., Gessner, R., Kleinert, A., Koopmann, R., Langen, J., Lopez-Puertas, M., Mosner, P., Nett, H., Oelhaf, H., Perron, G., Remedios, J., Ridol, M., Stiller, G., and Zander, R.: An Instrument for Atmospheric and Climate Research, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., in preparation, 2007.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



corresponding to an interferometer maximum path difference equal to 20 cm) during a period of two years. In this standard observation mode, the instrument scanned 17 tangent altitudes for each limb sequence, viewing in the rearward direction along the orbit with a sampling rate of approximately 500 km along track and with a horizontal resolution across track of about 30 km. The vertical scanning grid ranges between 6 km and 68 km, with steps of 3 km from 6 to 42 km, 5 km from 42 to 52 km, and 8 km from 52 to 68 km. On a daily basis, MIPAS covers the Earth with 5° latitude by 12.5° longitude spacing. Complete global coverage is attained approximately every three days by 73 scans per orbit and 14.3 orbits per day scanning the latitudinal range from 87° S to 89° N. MIPAS operation was temporarily halted at the end of March 2004 because of excessive anomalies observed in the Interferometric Drive Unit and resumed in January 2005 in a new operation mode at reduced spectral resolution (0.0625 cm<sup>-1</sup>) and on a finer vertical grid. The data obtained during the instrument full spectral resolution mission, from 6 July 2002 to 26 March 2004, have been processed by using v4.61 and v4.62 of ESA level-1b and level-2 operational algorithms, as described in details in [Kleinert et al. \(2006\)](#) and in [Raspollini et al. \(2006\)](#) respectively, and provide a self-consistent set of quasi-continuous measurements for temperature and the six target species. For the purposes of MIPAS ozone validation, the two versions of ESA operational processor are substantially equivalent; as a baseline for our comparisons we have generally adopted v4.61 data, using v4.62 only for those cases where v4.61 ozone profiles in coincidence with the selected validation measurements were not available. Retrieval of Ozone VMR vertical distribution for v4.61/v4.62 data products was carried out using three microwindows: microwindows [1122.800–1125.800] cm<sup>-1</sup> and [1039.375–1040.325] cm<sup>-1</sup> (the latter used in the altitude interval 52–68 km), in MIPAS band AB, associated with the ozone fundamental modes  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_3$ , and microwindow [763.375–766.375] cm<sup>-1</sup>, in MIPAS band A, close to the center of the O<sub>3</sub>  $\nu_2$  band. The total error budget on the ozone vertical distribution retrieved from individual MIPAS scans can be evaluated by combining the random contribution due to the mapping of the radiometric measurement noise into

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1 I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

the retrieved profiles (expressed by the root-mean-square of the diagonal elements of the error variance-covariance matrix included in ESA level-2 data products) and the climatological estimates of systematic components derived from the analysis carried out at University of Oxford (see data available for the different atmospheric scenarios at <http://www-atm.physics.ox.ac.uk/group/mipas/err>, hereafter indicated as “Oxford University error data set”). In the case of ozone retrievals, the dominating sources of systematic uncertainty come from the propagation of pressure and temperature retrieval error, from spectroscopic errors and from the effects due to atmospheric horizontal gradients, as well as from radiometric gain and calibration errors. Further systematic components, such as those due to interfering species ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{O}_5$ ) or non-local thermal equilibrium (NLTE) effects contribute less than 1% to the total error budget. NLTE can have a larger effect above 55 km.

### 3 Ozone correlative data sets and validation strategy

The coordinated effort for the validation of MIPAS operational ozone data v4.61/v4.62 involved the comparison with collocated measurements of the  $\text{O}_3$  vertical distribution from a variety of observation platforms and techniques and the combination of the resulting pieces of information into coherent and quantitative statements about the validity of the selected products. We exploited different categories of correlative data, obtained from ground-based stations, from high altitude aircraft and balloon campaigns and from other satellite missions as well as from assimilated  $\text{O}_3$  fields by ECMWF. We took advantage of the redundancy and complementarity of the reference data sets to strengthen the statistical confidence in our results and to achieve the widest spatial (vertical and geographical) and temporal (diurnal and seasonal) coverage. To this aim, and within the practical limits posed by the large number of validation measurements, special attention was paid to the selection of uniform criteria and methods for individual comparison. With reference to the general guidelines proposed by Fischer et al. (2007)<sup>1</sup> for the validation of MIPAS operational products, we adopted baseline

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

criteria of 300 km and 3 h as the ideal for maximum spatial and temporal separation respectively between MIPAS and the correlative ozone profiles. Departure from these criteria was allowed in a number of specific cases and under suitable conditions, up to a maximum of 500 km and 10 h, in order to increase the statistical value of the comparison. A validation approach relying on the terminology and methodology described in [Von Clarmann \(2006\)](#) for the statistical bias and precision determination with matching pairs of O<sub>3</sub> VMR measurements was followed (cp., for instance, Sect. 6) and in some cases rigorously applied to evaluate the effects of coincidence errors or horizontal smoothing (cp. Sect. 4.4). Comparisons were mostly performed between profiles of O<sub>3</sub> VMR using pressure as vertical coordinate. Profiles measured at much higher vertical resolution than that of MIPAS were convolved with the averaging kernels and a priori profiles associated with the MIPAS retrievals, in order to reduce comparison errors due to vertical smoothing differences. This operation was generally performed by using a common routine. Trajectory Hunting Techniques were applied to calculate lagrangian coincidences, whenever direct matching did not provide sufficient statistics for the comparison (particularly in the case of the comparison with balloon-borne measurements, cp. Sect. 5).

## 4 Comparison with WMO/GAW ground-based measurements

### 4.1 Comparison with NDACC and WOUDC ozone sondes, lidar and microwave networks

#### 4.1.1 NDACC and WOUDC data

A comprehensive intercomparison between MIPAS ozone measurements and correlative data obtained from extensive ground-based networks contributing to WMO's (World Meteorological Organisation) Global Atmosphere Watch (GAW) programme was carried out at the Belgian Institute for Space Aeronomy (BIRA-IASB). The comparison

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

data set included ozone profiles from 39 ozone sonde stations (O3S), 8 lidar systems (LID) and 7 microwave radiometers (MWR) associated with the Network for Detection of Atmospheric Composition Change (NDACC), formerly the NDSC (Kurylo and Zander, 2001), and/or the World Ozone and Ultraviolet Data Centre (WOUDC). Prior to using data uploaded routinely to the WOUDC archive, their quality was investigated carefully on statistical and climatological grounds. Stations and instruments contributing to the present study are listed in Table 1. Electrochemical cell (ECC) ozone sondes are launched more or less regularly on board of small meteorological balloons at a variety of stations from pole to pole. They yield the vertical distribution of ozone VMR from the ground up to burst point, the latter occurring typically around 30 km. Ozone VMR recorded at a typical vertical resolution of 100–150 m is converted into ozone number density using pressure and temperature data recorded on-board the same balloon. Error on the ozone profile of ozone sonde depends of a large number of parameters. For ECC sonde important parameters are: the manufacturer of the sonde (SPC or EnSci), the percentage of the sensing solution used in the electrochemical cell and the type of correction applied for pump efficiency. Unfortunately, this information is not always given or well identified in the data files. However, as shown during the JOSIE (Jülich Ozone Sonde Intercomparison Experiment) chamber comparison (Smit and Sträter, 2004), if ozone sondes are operated in a specific way, a similar level of precision and accuracy is achievable from the different sonde types. Typical error estimates are :

- systematic error from 3% (0–20 km) to 5% (20–35 km);
- precision from 5% (0–20 km) to 7% (20–35 km).

Differential absorption ozone lidar (DIAL) systems provide the vertical distribution of night-time ozone number density at altitudes between 8–15 km and 45–50 km. Actual operation depends on the cloud cover and other measurement conditions. The typical integration time of an ozone measurement in the whole stratosphere is 4 h. Typical vertical resolution ranges from 300 m up to 3 km depending on the altitude. The accuracy of the lidar ozone profile depends on the duration of the measurement and on

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1

1

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

the vertical resolution chosen to process the data. Individual errors bars are given in each ozone le. Typical accuracy estimates range from 3 to 7% from 15 to 40 km. At 40–45 km and above, due to the rapid decrease in signal to noise ratio, the error bars increase and significant bias reaching 10% may exist ( [McDermid et al., 1998](#); [Godin et al., 1999](#)).

Millimetre wave radiometers (MWR) operate night and day, providing ozone VMR integrated over typically 2 h (a few stations provide shorter integration time) from 20–25 to 70 km, with a vertical resolution of 8 to 12 km. Ozone VMR is converted into number density using ECMWF or NCEP meteorological analyses of pressure and temperature. The individual errors bars usually are given in each ozone data le. Typical accuracy ranges from 5% at 20 km to 20% at 70 km where the information content is smaller leaving a larger weight to a priori constraints ([Connor et al., 1995](#); [Tsou, 1995](#); [Tsou, 2000](#)). Its low vertical resolution poses additional problems for comparisons, for which dedicated methods have been developed ([Calisesi et al., 2005](#)).

Taking into account the ground-based error contribution does not change the total error budget dramatically: this contribution is small compared to the contribution of both MIPAS errors and horizontal smoothing differences in presence of large horizontal inhomogeneities in the ozone eld.

As the comparisons are based on profiles convoluted with MIPAS averaging kernels, for the ground-based error, according to [Calisesi et al. \(2005\)](#), we have considered the term:

$$AK^T W^T S_{GR} W AK$$

where AK is MIPAS averaging kernel matrix, W the interpolation matrix from ground-based grid to MIPAS grid and  $S_{GR}$  the ground-based error covariance.

The study is based on MIPAS off-line processor version 4.61 data and it covers 2003. A moderate relaxation of space and time collocation criteria with respect to the agreed baseline was introduced, to find the best trade-off between the opposite requirements of statistical relevance of the results and minimum comparison error associated with the spatial and temporal separation of the measurements:

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1

2

3

4

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- 500 km from ground-based station to tangent point; and
- O3S or LID within 6 h;
- MWR: within 2 h at Kiruna, Zugspitze, Mauna Loa and Lauder;
- MWR: within 15 min at Payerne, Bremen and Ny-Ålesund (shorter integration time).

The comparison/validation strategy consisted of two steps:

- Investigation based on ozone partial columns defined by the pressure levels [75–35], [35–15], [15–7], [7–3] and [3–0.8] hPa and aimed at re-grouping different stations around principal systems with similar patterns of partial column differences and making a phenomenological separation between atmospheric layers dominated by dynamics and layers dominated by photo-chemistry.
- Based on the classification obtained from the previous step and starting from the time series of ozone partial column, identification of time periods where the agreement has a constant behaviour and derivation of vertically resolved statistics.

#### 4.1.2 Error budget of ground-based comparisons

MIPAS and ground-based instruments offer a different perception of atmospheric ozone. Such differences must be considered to interpret comparison results properly. To evaluate the comparison error budget, we took into account, along with the measurement and retrieval error of MIPAS and of the correlative instrument, the contributions associated with the vertical and horizontal smoothing differences and with the spatial separation of the two ozone profiles. Expanding Rodgers' theory and formalism (Rodgers, 1990), we considered, therefore, the following total comparison error covariance  $S$ .

$$S = S_M + S_N + (A_{M,V} - A_{N,V}) S_V (A_{M,V} - A_{N,V})^T + (A_{M,H} - A_{N,H}) S_H (A_{M,H} - A_{N,H})^T + S_{\Delta O_3} \quad (1)$$

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

where:

$S_M$  = MIPAS error (measurement, retrieval and retrieval parameters)

$S_N$  = Correlative instrument error (measurement, retrieval and retrieval parameters)

$A_M$  = MIPAS averaging kernels, vertical (V index) and horizontal (H index)

5  $A_N$  = Correlative instrument averaging kernels, vertical (V) and horizontal (H)

$S_V$  = Atmospheric variability covariance (vertical)

$S_H$  = Atmospheric variability covariance (horizontal)

$S_{\Delta O_3}$  = Spatial distance error

10 The effect of differences in vertical resolution can be estimated by means of the vertical averaging kernels (AK) associated with the MIPAS retrieval of the ozone profile. First, AKs of the low-resolution data are used to map the high-resolution profile to the low-resolution perception. The a priori profile used in Optimal Estimation retrievals is also included as it may introduce an additional bias. Second, the smoothing difference error is estimated as the difference between the smoothed and original profiles. For  
15 MIPAS comparison with high vertical resolution measurements (O3S or lidar):

$$\Delta x_V = x_a^M + A_M (x_N - x_a^M) - x_N \quad (2)$$

where:

$\Delta x_V$  = Vertical smoothing error

20  $x_N$  = High resolution profile (O3S or lidar)

$x_a^M$  = MIPAS ozone profile used to compute the vertical averaging kernels

and for MIPAS comparison with lower vertical resolution measurements (MWR):

$$\Delta x_V = x_a^N + A_N (x_M - x_a^N) - x_M \quad (3)$$

25 where:

$x_M$  = High resolution profile (MIPAS)

$x_a^N$  = MWR a priori ozone profiles

As the MIPAS processor retrieves only one-dimensional profiles, no AKs are available for the study of horizontal smoothing. The MIPAS uncertainties associated with horizontal smoothing are calculated rather as an estimate of the ozone gradient interfering with the MIPAS line of sight (LOS), that is, the horizontal component of atmospheric noise associated with the MIPAS measurement. We use Eq. (4):

$$\Delta x_H = \pm \text{abs} \left( \vec{\nabla} x_{\text{MEDIAN}} \cdot \vec{T}_{\text{ENVISAT}} \right) | \text{MIPAS} |_{90\%} \quad (4)$$

where:  $\Delta x_H$  = Horizontal smoothing error (or horizontal component of atmospheric noise)

$\vec{\nabla} x_{\text{MEDIAN}}$  = Ozone gradient at the median point of MIPAS LOS

$\vec{T}_{\text{ENVISAT}}$  = ENVISAT direction (MIPAS LOS is backward along track)

$| \text{MIPAS} |_{90\%}$  = LOS extension of 90% information air mass. The ozone gradient is

estimated from 4-dimensional ozone fields generated by the Belgian Assimilation System of Chemical Observations from ENVISAT (BASCOE, [Errera and Fonteyn, 2001](#); [Fonteyn et al., 2003](#)). BASCOE is a data assimilation system of stratospheric chemistry using the four-dimensional variational (4D-VAR) method. In the course of a run, BASCOE can ingest satellite observations. The resulting “assimilated field” is an estimate of the chemical composition of the stratosphere based both on the set of observations and on the physical laws describing the evolution of the system synthesized into the model. They are defined at 37 hybrid pressure levels from 0.1 hPa down to the surface. The horizontal resolution of BASCOE standard outputs is 3.75° in latitude by 5° in longitude. For our study we have used off-line version v3d24 of BASCOE fields.

Finally, to complete the comparison error budget, the ozone partial column difference induced by the spatial/temporal separation of the two ozone profiles can be estimated by:

$$\Delta O_3 = O_3 \left( |x_{\text{MEDIAN}}^{\text{MIPAS}}| \right) - O_3 \left( |x_{\text{STATION}}| \right) \quad (5)$$



where  $|X_{\text{MEDIAN}}^{\text{MIPAS}}|$  is the estimated geolocation of the median point of MIPAS LOS,  $|X_{\text{STATION}}|$  is the ground-based station geolocation and  $O_3(X)$  the ozone partial column at the corresponding location and time estimated using BASCOE assimilated ozone  
 elds. The along orbit distribution – median position and 90% extension as a function  
 of tangent altitude – of the MIPAS information content was estimated by DeClercq and  
 Lambert (2006) using their two-dimensional radiative transfer model of the MIPAS full  
 limb scanning sequence. It is important to note that BASCOE absolute ozone  
 elds have shown to compare reasonably to HALOE, CRISTA and MLS and, more important  
 here, that relative elds are accurate ( Errera and Fonteyn, 2001; Fonteyn et al., 2003).

#### 4.1.3 Time series of $O_3$ partial column differences: result and discussion

The rst segment of our study concentrated on the analysis of time series of the dif-  
 ferences between MIPAS and ground-based ozone partial column data. The analy-  
 sis included assessments of the different contributions to the total comparison error,  
 as de ned in Sect. 4.1.2. Comparison results vary signi cantly between the lower  
 stratosphere (LS), where dynamics and chemistry interfere, with clear in uences of  
 tropospheric dynamics, and the higher stratosphere (HS), where photo-chemistry dom-  
 inates. Consequently, a classi cation based on regularities in the pattern of the  $O_3$  par-  
 tial column differences emerges: in the lower stratosphere (75–35 hPa), results regroup  
 around synoptic and regional systems and the systems linked to stratospheric trans-  
 port; reaching into the middle stratosphere (35–15 hPa), we move from large synoptic  
 groups to a more zonal behaviour and we can extend the previously described synop-  
 tic systems to group more stations; in the middle and upper stratosphere (15–7 hPa,  
 7–3 hPa, 3–0.8 hPa), zonal symmetry becomes dominant and comparisons results fol-  
 low this behaviour. Deviations from zonal symmetry nevertheless exist and must be  
 taken into account. A typical output of the comparison carried out for each of the afore-  
 mentioned groups of measurement sites is displayed in Fig. 1, presenting the results  
 obtained at Western and Central Europe stations. The plot shows, as black dots, the

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1

1

2

1

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

percentage relative difference in ozone partial column (73–35 hPa) between MIPAS and correlative ozone sonde data at Western and Central Europe stations over 2003, and smoothing and collocation errors (running mean in plain and standard deviation in dashed) estimated by the aforementioned methods. Grey rectangles identify monthly means (central line) and standard deviations of the differences.

In general, the comparison error is dominated by the effect of differences in horizontal smoothing of atmospheric variability. While ground-based instrumentation captures only a portion of the air mass probed by MIPAS, MIPAS smoothes atmospheric inhomogeneities over several hundred kilometres. Red curves in Fig. 1 give the range of atmospheric variability smoothed by the MIPAS measurement, that is, an upper limit of the expected difference between MIPAS and ground-based ozone column data. We can conclude from the plot that differences in horizontal smoothing can account for the observed standard deviation of the comparisons in most of the cases, but not for systematic differences as those appearing in Fig. 1 in summer 2003. Horizontal smoothing differences are followed in magnitude by errors associated with geolocation differences. The latter also correlate with the standard deviation of comparisons, but their amplitude is dominated by MIPAS horizontal smoothing effects. Errors associated with vertical smoothing differences are smaller. Their effect could account for a small, constant offset in the comparisons. In most cases, comparison results can be interpreted by considering the different error contributions. However, in some cases, they cannot account fully for the difference noticed between MIPAS and correlative partial column data. MIPAS reports larger partial columns than the ground based-instruments:

- (a) in the 75–35 hPa layer at stations from northern (see Fig. 1) and southern mid latitudes, equator and tropics;
- (b) at 35–15 hPa over stations at the equator, in the tropics, and in Antarctica during ozone hole event; and
- (c) in the 3–0.8 hPa layer at European stations.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

IJ

I I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

At 7–3 hPa, MIPAS partial columns underestimate correlative observations in Hawaii. The comparison error budget cannot account for these observed differences. In all other analysed situations, MIPAS partials column data agree well with those reported by the ground-based instrumentation, and the observed differences fit well within the comparison error budget.

#### 4.1.4 Comparison of O<sub>3</sub> vertical profiles: results and discussion

The first step of our analysis was instrumental in getting an overall view of the agreement between MIPAS and WMO/GAW ground-based data, and also in determining time periods and groups of stations where comparison results are sufficiently consistent to allow the meaningful derivation of statistical values. As a second step of our analysis, we derived vertically resolved statistics of the comparisons between MIPAS v4.61 ozone profiles and correlative data obtained at NDACC and Woudc stations. The comparisons have been performed at each individual station listed in Table 1 and summary plots have been computed for stations belonging to the same synoptic system/ zonal region and showing mostly identical comparison results. The groups are the same as above, except that in this case we have separated ozone sondes and lidar results to allow better discrimination of ground-based error contributions.

At Arctic, Northern and Southern middle latitude sites, the results can be separated between 1 October to 31 March and 1 April to 30 September. At tropical and equatorial stations, the weak seasonal variation allows us to draw annual plots. At Antarctic stations results can be separated between “ozone hole” (21 August to 15 October) and “normal ozone” periods (16 October to 20 August).

A few examples of the results obtained for the absolute and relative differences of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> vertical profiles with ozone sonde and lidar data are shown in Fig. 2a and b, respectively. Each plot of Fig. 2 shows, for each collocated pair of profiles, absolute differences between MIPAS and correlative measurements (light grey lines). To eliminate vertical smoothing differences, high-resolution correlative measurements have been previously convoluted with MIPAS averaging kernels and biased by the first-guess pro-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

le, following the method proposed by [Rodgers and Connor \(2003\)](#). Black lines depict statistical values (mean and  $1\sigma$  standard deviation) of the absolute or relative differences between MIPAS and ground-based data. Red lines depict the total systematic error of the comparison. The mean difference between MIPAS and ground station data should be compared to these lines. The total systematic error of the comparison is calculated as the sum of MIPAS systematic error and the systematic bias due to non-perfect collocation (spatial/temporal distance, as explained in Sect. 4.1.2). The yellow block delimited by dashed red lines depicts the total random error of the comparison. This value should be compared with the  $1\sigma$  standard deviation of the differences. This total random error of the comparison is calculated as the quadratic sum of MIPAS random error, ground-based random error, random contribution of spatial/temporal distance and LOS inhomogeneity.

Figures 3a and b show the results of the comparison, with ozone sonde and lidar respectively, in terms of relative differences. These results are similar to those obtained from the absolute difference comparisons, but should be considered carefully:

- The total error budget of the comparison is firstly calculated for absolute difference and secondly a percentage is estimated.
- Low ozone concentrations lead to large relative difference although absolute differences are small. In these cases, mean and standard deviation of relative difference are not relevant. The percentages obtained below 12–15 km at middle and high latitudes, below 20 km at tropical and equatorial station, and during “ozone hole” in Antarctica shouldn't be considered.

An overall summary of the results obtained from the comparison of  $O_3$  vertical profiles is presented in Table 2, with a detailed assessment of the quality of the agreement between MIPAS and ground-based measurements (O3S, LID and MWR) for each altitude region and synoptic or regional system.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## 4.2 Comparison with NDACC/EQUAL lidar network

### 4.2.1 The EQUAL O<sub>3</sub> validation data set

A purely statistical analysis of the differences between MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> vertical profiles and lidar data was carried out by the groups involved in the EQUAL (Envisat Quality Assessment with Lidar) project, based substantially on the same NDACC data set adopted by the BIRA team for the pseudo-global intercomparison described in Sect. 4.1, i.e. the measurements from the ground-based lidar stations listed in Table 1, with the addition of the Eureka (Lat. 80.05° N; Lon. 86.42° W) site. The selection of collocated pairs of MIPAS and lidar observations was based on matching criteria slightly relaxed with respect to the agreed baseline, in order to get a sufficient number of coincident profiles for a statistically meaningful comparison: the useful matches were chosen within a 400 km, 10 h window. A total of 627 matching pairs was identified and was used to validate MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> level 2 off-line data v4.61 and v4.62 in the period from 6 July 2002 to 26 March 2004. The comparison was based on a statistical analysis of the differences between profiles of O<sub>3</sub> number density measured as a function of altitude by MIPAS and by lidar stations in the range from 10 km to 50 km. The vertical co-ordinate for MIPAS profiles was transferred from pressure to altitude by using ECMWF data: we interpolated ECMWF pressure and geo-potential height (GPH) to the MIPAS retrieval pressure grid and converted the resulting GPH values to geometric altitude.

### 4.2.2 Results and discussion

The results of the comparison for the whole set of collocated pairs are summarised in Fig. 4. On the left panel, the mean profiles of O<sub>3</sub> number density measured by MIPAS and by lidars are displayed, along with the corresponding 1 $\sigma$  standard deviations. The mean and the median of the percentage differences between MIPAS and lidar O<sub>3</sub> profiles relative to the lidar values are plotted in the middle panel. On the same graph, we show the mean relative difference  $\pm 1\sigma$  standard deviation (light green profiles) and

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

indicate, for some of the altitude levels, the number of MIPAS and lidar pairs taken into account by the statistics at that level. On the right panel, the standard deviation of the relative differences is compared with the standard deviations of the selected MIPAS and lidar profiles. The mean relative difference is lower than  $\pm 5\%$  between 15 and 40 km, whilst slightly larger values of positive and negative bias (up to  $\pm 15\%$ ) are obtained outside this altitude range, respectively above 40 km and below 15 km. The quality of the agreement in the lower and middle stratosphere is confirmed by the substantial match between the mean and the median of the differences at these altitudes. The occurrence of outliers in the distribution of the relative differences leads to an increase of the standard deviation and, when asymmetric, introduces a discrepancy between the mean and the median values, as it happens, in our case, at altitudes below 20 km and – to a lesser extent – above 35–40 km. To better identify possible sources of the observed discrepancies, we have extended the statistical analysis of MIPAS and lidar  $O_3$  collocated profiles, by investigating their latitude dependency. No distinction was found between Southern and Northern hemisphere. We calculated the mean and the median of the relative differences, as well as their standard deviations, for three latitude bands corresponding to the Tropical (from the Equator to latitude  $23.5^\circ$ ), to Mid-latitude (from latitude  $23.5^\circ$  to  $66.5^\circ$ ) and to the Polar (from latitude  $66.5^\circ$  to the Pole) regions; the results are displayed in Fig. 5. A small positive bias (less than 5%) is generally found between 20 and 40 km both in the Mid-latitude and in the Tropical regions, with the exception of the 21–24 km range in the latter, where the mean difference increases up to 10%. At the Tropics larger values of the mean relative differences (up to 50%) are found below 20 km, associated with a standard deviation of the differences that exceeds those of the individual instruments. At high latitudes, MIPAS  $O_3$  data are biased low with respect to the lidar measurements, with differences that remain always below 7% from 15 km up to 40 km altitude. Once again, the discrepancy increases at the lowest tangent altitude of MIPAS (below 12 km), with a negative bias up to  $-20\%$  and a standard deviation of the mean relative differences comparable to the ones of MIPAS and lidar profiles. Notably, the larger differences between the mean and the median of

MIPAS ozone  
validation

U. Cortesi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

IJ

I I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

the distribution observed below 20 km are mostly localised at mid-latitude, while elsewhere remain either small (less than a few percent in the Polar region) or negligible (at the Tropics) for the whole altitude range.

### 4.3 Comparison with NDACC FTIR network

#### 5 4.3.1 FTIR data

MIPAS v4.61 ozone data in the period 6 July 2002 to 26 March 2004 are compared with ground-based Fourier Transform InfraRed (FTIR) measurements at five stations: Kiruna, Sweden (67.8° N, 20.4° E) and Jungfraujoch, Switzerland (46.5° N, 8.0° E) in the Northern Hemisphere, and Lauder, New Zealand (45.0° S, 169.7° E), Wollongong, Australia (34.4° S, 150.5° E), and Arrival Heights, Antarctica (77.5° S, 166.4° E) in the Southern Hemisphere. These instruments are all operated within the NDACC. Quality control is applied according to the NDACC guidelines. In addition to column amounts of O<sub>3</sub>, low vertical resolution profiles are obtained from solar absorption spectra by using the Optimal Estimation Method of [Rodgers \(2000\)](#) in the inversion programs, namely PROFIT (PROFile FIT) for Kiruna station, described by [Hase et al. \(2000\)](#) and by [Hase et al. \(2004\)](#) and based on the forward model KOPRA (Karlsruhe Optimized Precise Radiative transfer Algorithm, [Höpfner et al., 1998](#)), and SFIT2 ([Pougatchev et al., 1995](#); [Rinsland et al., 1998](#)) for the other stations. The SFIT2 and PROFITT codes have been cross-validated successfully by [Hase et al. \(2004\)](#). The retrieval process, in both codes, involves the selection of retrieval parameters: spectral microwindows, spectroscopic parameters, a priori information, and model parameters. The choice of these retrieval parameters has been optimized independently at each station. An exception was made for the spectroscopic database: all stations agreed in using the HITRAN 2004 database ([Rothman et al., 2005](#)) in order to avoid biases due to different spectroscopic parameters. For 49 infrared bands of O<sub>3</sub> the line positions and intensities have been indeed updated in the HITRAN 2004 database following those of the MIPAS database (mipas-pf-3.1 for the v4.61 products) ([Raspollini et al., 2006](#)).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

### 4.3.2 Methodology of the comparison

Pairs of coincident ozone profiles from MIPAS and from each of the five FTIR stations are selected for comparison according to the baseline criteria ( $\pm 3$  h, 300 km), with spatial separation between satellite and ground-based observations evaluated at the MIPAS nominal tangent height of 21 km. Each spatially collocated MIPAS scan is compared with the mean of the FTIR measurements recorded within the chosen temporal coincidence criterion. The comparison is made on a pressure grid. The MIPAS profiles are degraded to the lower vertical resolution of the ground-based FTIR measurements, following:

$$x_s = x_a + A(x_m - x_a) \quad (6)$$

where  $x_m$  and  $x_s$  are the original and the smoothed MIPAS profiles and  $x_a$  and  $A$  are the FTIR a priori profile and averaging kernel matrix, respectively.

For the sake of homogeneity, a common approach was agreed for the calculation of  $O_3$  partial columns and vertical profile differences in the comparisons.

Vertical profiles – we calculated the absolute difference (MIPAS-FTIR) between MIPAS smoothed profiles and the low vertical resolution FTIR measurements. The mean relative difference in percent and the associated  $1\sigma$  standard deviation were then obtained by dividing the mean absolute differences and standard deviation, respectively, by the mean of the FTIR  $O_3$  profiles.

Partial Columns – the boundaries of partial columns, defined by pressure levels as indicated in Table 3, were chosen taking into account:

- the ground-based FTIR sensitivity, which is reasonable up to around 40 km for  $O_3$ ;
- the lowest altitudes of valid MIPAS profiles which have a mean of about 12 km over the data set selected for comparison;

As for the vertical profiles, we first calculated the absolute differences between MIPAS and FTIR  $O_3$  partial columns and then divided these by the mean of the FTIR partial

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



columns to obtain the relative differences. In Table 3, the mean and the standard deviation of the partial column relative differences are reported for each station, along with the number N of coincident pairs and the estimated random error on the O<sub>3</sub> partial column differences. We have evaluated the random error covariance matrix of the difference MIPAS – FTIR, using the work of Rodgers and Connor (2003) for the comparison of remote sounding instruments and of Calisesi et al. (2005) for the re-gridding between the MIPAS and the FTIR data (see Vigouroux et al., 2006 for more details). The FTIR random error budget has been estimated for a typical measurement at Kiruna (F. Hase, IMK, private communication). There are different contributions to the MIPAS random error covariance matrix. The error covariance matrix due to the noise is given in the MIPAS level 2 products for each profile. We have chosen to use, as the noise contribution to the MIPAS random error matrix, the mean of the covariance matrices of the coincident MIPAS profiles. Two coincident MIPAS profiles at Lauder have been removed from the comparisons, because their random errors were especially large. Following the approach adopted for MIPAS comparison with other satellite measurements, we have added to the MIPAS random error budget the systematic errors with random variability (i.e. error due to propagation of pressure and temperature random covariance into the ozone retrieval), as explained in detail in Sect. 6.

#### 4.3.3 Results of O<sub>3</sub> partial column intercomparison

Time series of O<sub>3</sub> partial columns at the five ground-based stations are displayed in Fig. 6. For each station, the upper panel in the plot shows the results of FTIR measurements and of collocated MIPAS data. In the lower panel, the mean relative differences between MIPAS and FTIR partial columns are plotted. In Table 3, we report the mean and the standard deviation of these relative differences for each station. The estimated random error on the relative difference of O<sub>3</sub> partial columns, combining the ground-based FTIR and MIPAS error budgets, is around 6% for all the stations except Arrival Heights (7%). The agreement is good for Kiruna, Jungfraujoch and Wollongong, where there is no statistically significant bias, as can be seen in Table 4 by

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

comparing the mean of the differences to the  $3\sigma$  standard error on the mean ( $SEM = 3 \cdot SD / \sqrt{N}$ ). A small negative bias of MIPAS  $O_3$  partial column is observed in the comparison with Lauder and Arrival Heights data, which is presently not explained by known contributions to the systematic error budget of the comparison. It must be noticed, however, that a spectral micro-window region at  $2100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  was selected for  $O_3$  retrieval at Lauder and Arrival Heights and that a high bias in ozone total column (on average, 4.5%) was observed when comparing these results with those obtained from the analysis of Arrival Heights spectra in retrievals employing micro-windows in the  $1000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  region. Differences, of up to 4%, have been observed in retrievals of total column  $O_3$  when employing different micro-window spectral regions (Rinsland et al., 1996). This suggests that different choices of spectral micro-windows might explain the different biases observed at different stations.

For all the stations, except Arrival Heights, the standard deviations are within 6%, which is comparable to the estimated random error on the difference. For Arrival Heights, the standard deviation (8.1%) is larger than the estimated random error of 7.1%. This is not surprising considering the potential vorticity differences between the observed MIPAS and ground-based air masses that can occur at the pole during the spring. The stronger atmospheric gradient at the poles during spring has not only an effect on the error due to the collocation of air masses; it also increases the horizontal smoothing error as already seen in Sect. 4.1. For comparison with Kiruna measurements, a PV criterion has been applied, so that critical coincidences with relative differences in potential vorticity larger than 15% have been neglected. For Arrival Heights, test performed by applying the same criterion resulted in a reduction of the standard deviation, but showed no influence on the bias.

#### 4.3.4 Results of $O_3$ vertical profiles intercomparison

Results of the comparison between  $O_3$  vertical profiles retrieved from collocated measurements of MIPAS and each of the five ground-based FTIR stations are displayed in Fig. 7. The individual plots show the mean and  $1\sigma$  standard deviation of the rela-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

tive differences (MIPAS – FTIR) in ozone volume mixing ratio versus pressure. The combined random error associated with the  $O_3$  mean difference is represented by the shaded grey area. The  $3\sigma$  standard error on the mean is also reported to facilitate the discussion of the statistical significance of the observed bias. The black solid lines in each plot mark the pressure levels adopted as the lower and upper limits for the calculations of ozone partial columns. We notice in Fig. 7 that, except of Kiruna, the profile differences are oscillating. First, one should remember that the retrieval of vertical profiles from ground-based FTIR solar absorption spectra is an ill-posed problem. Therefore, the inversion needs to be constrained by some a priori information and the inversion results depend on this information and on some additional retrieval parameters, as mentioned in Sect. 4.3.1. The number of degrees of freedom for signal of the retrieved profiles between 12 and 40 km is only about 3.5. In the present exercise we did not define a common retrieval strategy for the five stations. Only for Lauder and Arrival Heights have similar retrieval parameters been used. This latter fact probably explains why we observe similar oscillations in the difference profiles at Lauder and Arrival Heights.

The bias is below 10% at Kiruna in the whole altitude range and usually not significant taking into account the  $3\sigma$  standard error on the mean. The bias is below 10% for Jungfraujoch, and 15% for Lauder and Wollongong, at pressures lower than 80 hPa. The bias is below 25% at Arrival Heights in the whole altitude range. The error can be statistically significant at some pressure levels, but, as previously pointed out, the FTIR profiles have to be interpreted with care considering their small degrees of freedom. Regarding the standard deviations, in Fig. 7, we can see that they are roughly in agreement with the combined random error in the middle stratosphere, whereas they are greater than the random error in the lower stratosphere, especially at Arrival Heights where the variability of  $O_3$  is expected to be larger.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## 4.4 Comparison with ozone soundings at individual mid-latitude stations

### 4.4.1 Mid-latitude ozone sounding data and comparison methodology

A statistical analysis of the differences between coincident  $O_3$  profiles obtained by MIPAS and by mid-latitude ozone sondes was conducted using the methodology suggested by [Von Clarmann \(2006\)](#) for bias and precision determination with matching pairs of measurements. The correlative data considered here consisted of ozone soundings from four sites, that were not included as part of the NDACC data sets selected in Sect. 4.1 and that were provided by.

- the team of University of L'Aquila, that contributed to the MIPAS validation activity by operating a VAISALA balloon sounding system from L'Aquila, Italy (42.38° N, 13.31° E), with ECC ozone sondes having a precision of 4–12% in the troposphere and 3–4% between 100 and 10 hPa. The various sources of systematic errors are also altitude dependent and are between  $\pm 12\%$  ([Komhyr et al., 1995](#));
- the team of University of Athens, that performed measurements of the  $O_3$  vertical profiles for the location of Athens, Greece (37.60° N, 23.40° E), by using electrochemical concentration cells (ECC, EN-SCI, Inc.), with corrections based on observations of the total ozone content made with the DOBSON spectrophotometer Nr. 118 installed at the campus of the Athens University;
- the team from Environment Canada and the University of Toronto that obtained  $O_3$  profiles in coincidence with MIPAS overpasses from ozone sondes launches in Vanscoy, Canada (52.02° N, 107.05° W) during the MANTRA (Middle Atmosphere Nitrogen TRend Assessment) balloon campaign in 2002;
- the team of the Institute of Atmospheric Physics of the Chinese Academy of Science, providing results of the ozone soundings from Beijing, China (39.48° N, 116.28° E) in the period 2002–2004.

Coincident pairs of MIPAS and ozone sondes profiles were selected by applying the baseline criteria of 300 km and 3 h for maximum spatial and temporal separation. The comparison was then carried out according to the procedure employed by [Ridol et al. \(2007\)](#). to validate MIPAS temperature data against radiosondes measurements from L'Aquila and Potenza. Here below we briefly summarise the basic steps of this approach, while referring to the above mentioned papers for a precise definition of the terminology and validation strategy ([Von Clarmann, 2006](#)) and for a more detailed explanation of the individual steps of the comparison and of the underlying approximations ([Ridol et al. , 2007](#)):

Vertical smoothing – First of all, we took into account the effects of MIPAS vertical smoothing on the comparison. Correlative ozone data on the same pressure grid of the MIPAS matching profile were obtained, by convolving the original high vertical resolution measurement of the ozone sonde  $x_{\text{ref,hires}}$ , with the MIPAS averaging kernels and a priori profile:

$$\hat{x}_{\text{ref,smoothed}} = \hat{x}_0 + \mathbf{A} (x_{\text{ref,hires}} - x_0) \quad (7)$$

where  $\hat{x}_{\text{ref,smoothed}}$  is the smoothed ozone sonde profile,  $\mathbf{A}$  is the MIPAS averaging kernel matrix and  $x_0$  is the a priori profile that was used as the linearisation point for the calculation of the averaging kernels. Both  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $x_0$  in Eq. (7) were represented over the vertical grid of the matching MIPAS profile by using the shrinking/stretching and interpolation methods described in [Raspollini et al. \(2006\)](#).  $\hat{x}_0$  is the ozone vertical distribution retrieved from MIPAS measurements when the true state of the atmosphere is equal to the a priori profile ( $x_{\text{ref,hires}} = x_0$ ).

Time and space collocation error – In order to correct for the temporal and spatial mismatch between MIPAS and the ozone sonde measurement of each comparison pair, we followed equation 15 in [Von Clarmann \(2006\)](#) using assimilated ozone fields from ECMWF:

$$\hat{x}_{\text{ref}} = \hat{x}_{\text{ref,smoothed}} + x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}} - x_{\text{ref}}^{\text{ecmwf}} \quad (8)$$

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

IJ

II

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

where  $x_{\text{ref}}^{\text{ecmwf}}$  is the ECMWF ozone field interpolated at the location and time of the ozone sounding, whilst the term  $x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}}$  is the ECMWF field at the location and time of MIPAS scan (see below).

Horizontal smoothing – in order to include the effects of MIPAS horizontal smoothing, the following expression was used for the calculation of  $x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}}$ :

$$x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}} = \text{diag} \left| A x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}} \right| \quad (9)$$

where  $x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}}$  is a matrix whose columns represent ECMWF  $\text{O}_3$  values interpolated at the time of each MIPAS scan and at the points along the MIPAS line of sight that we used to calculate A. A detailed description of the procedure adopted for the calculation of  $x_{\text{mipas}}^{\text{ecmwf}}$  can be found in (Ridol et al., 2007).

Binning in pressure – MIPAS  $\text{O}_3$  measurements and ozone sonde corrected values from the selected pairs of coincident profiles were binned in pressure according to the vertical grid defined by MIPAS nominal retrieval levels, so that no more than a single entry per profile could be associated to each pressure bin. This allowed us to discard vertical correlations between values of the individual profiles and to perform a statistical analysis over the binned pairs, in the hypothesis that horizontal correlation between measurements are negligible after debiasing, as suggested in section 8 of the paper by Von Clarmann (2006).

Determination of the bias – The bias  $b_i$  at the  $i$ th pressure bin was computed from the expression:

$$b_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} [x_{\text{mipas},i}(k) - x_{\text{ref},i}(k)] \quad (10)$$

with the associated standard deviation given by:

$$\sigma_{b_i} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} [x_{\text{mipas},i}(k) - x_{\text{ref},i}(k) - b_i]^2}{n_i(n_i - 1)}} \quad (11)$$

where the sums extend over the  $n_i$  comparison pairs that provide a valid entry for the  $i$ th bin. The validation of our current estimate of MIPAS systematic error  $\sigma_{\text{mipas},\text{sys}}$ , obtained from the climatological values provided by University of Oxford, requires that the bias  $b_i$  is equal to zero within its total uncertainty  $\sigma_{b_i,\text{tot}}$ , expressed by:

$$\sigma_{b_i,\text{tot}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{b_i}^2 + \sigma_{b_i,\text{sys}}^2} \quad (12)$$

where  $\sigma_{b_i,\text{sys}}$  is the systematic error on the bias that we evaluated from the root-sum-square of  $\sigma_{\text{mipas},\text{sys}}$  and of the ozone sonde systematic error  $\sigma_{\text{ref},\text{sys}}$  (associated with the corrected value  $x_{\text{ref}}$  and calculated from the estimated bias of the ozone sonde):

$$\sigma_{b_i,\text{sys}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{mipas},i,\text{sys}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{ref},i,\text{sys}}^2} \quad (13)$$

Determination of the precision – we calculated the precision  $p_i$  of the result of the comparison at each pressure bin:

$$p_i = \sigma_{b_i} \sqrt{n_i} \quad (14)$$

and compared it with the random error of the difference  $d_i(k) = x_{\text{mipas},i}(k) - x_{\text{ref},i}(k)$  given by:

$$\sigma_{d_i,\text{rnd}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{mipas},i,\text{rnd}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{ref},i,\text{rnd}}^2} \quad (15)$$

where  $\sigma_{\text{mipas},i,\text{rnd}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{ref},i,\text{rnd}}$  are the random errors of MIPAS and of the ozone sonde respectively. In order to validate MIPAS random error, we must verify that the precision  $p_i$  is consistent with the random error of the comparison  $\sigma_{d_i,\text{rnd}}$ .

#### 4.4.2 Results of the comparison

The statistical analysis described in section 4.4.1 was applied to a validation data set consisting of 22 matching pairs of MIPAS and ozone sonde profiles. The results obtained from the application of Eqs. (7) through (15) are presented in Table 4, where we report for each altitude bin the bias  $b_i$  and its standard deviation  $\sigma_{b_i}$ , the total error  $\sigma_{b_i,tot}$  and the systematic error  $\sigma_{b_i,sys}$  on the bias, the precision  $p_i$  and the random error  $\sigma_{d_i,rand}$  on the difference  $d_i$ .

The quantities  $\chi^2_{R,i}$  and  $L_i$  in the last two columns of Table 4 characterise the significance levels of these results. The reduced chi-square  $\chi^2_{R,i}$ , with expectation value equal to 1.0, is defined by:

$$\chi^2_{R,i} = \frac{1}{(n_i - 1)} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \frac{[x_{mipas,i}(k) - x_{ref,i}(k) - b_i]^2}{\sigma_{d_i,rand}^2} \quad (16)$$

and tests the consistency of the differences  $d_i(k)$  with their expectation value  $b_i$  within their random error  $\sigma_{d_i,rand}$ .  $L_i$  is the probability that a new comparison might yield a smaller value of the reduced chi-square  $\chi^2_{R,i}$ .

In the left panel of Fig. 8, the vertical profile of the bias  $b_i$  is shown as a function of the approximate center altitude of each pressure bin (solid line), with error bars corresponding to the 95% confidence interval derived from the t-statistics for each altitude bin (see Ridollet et al., 2007, and reference therein). For comparison, the curves  $\pm\sigma_{b_i,sys}$  of the systematic error of the bias (dashed lines) are overplotted. A statistically significant bias (i.e. a bias that is different from zero beyond the 95% confidence interval defined above) is found for most of the altitude bins. This bias is, however, consistently lower than the combined systematic error of the comparison, as expected to validate the current estimate of MIPAS systematic uncertainties.

In the right panel of Fig. 8, the precision  $p_i$  (solid line) is compared with the random error  $\sigma_{d_i,rand}$  on the difference  $d_i$  (dashed line); here, the error bars represent the 95%



confidence interval computed from the chi square statistics of each altitude bin. We observe a reasonable agreement between the two curves over the whole range of the comparison, with significant discrepancies found for the altitude bins at 21, 15 and 12 km, where in any case the precision value never exceeds the combined random error by a factor larger than 2.

## 5 Comparison with stratospheric balloon and aircraft measurements

### 5.1 MIPAS-B2

#### 5.1.1 MIPAS-B2 data and comparison methodology

A balloon-borne version of the MIPAS-ENVISAT instrument, MIPAS-B2, operated by a team of Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe (IMK-FZK), was flown during mid-latitude (Aire sur l'Adour, France, 24 September 2002) and Arctic (Kiruna, Sweden, 20–21 March 2003 and 3 July 2003) validation flights and obtained a set of correlative data in very good spatial and temporal coincidence with the satellite measurements (Oelhaf et al., 2003). The high quality of the collocations, combined with several features of the MIPAS-B2 instrument configuration that are closely matching those of MIPAS-ENVISAT (spectral coverage, spectral resolution, sensitivity and radiometric accuracy, etc.), offer an unique opportunity for the validation of the vertical profiles of ozone and other MIPAS target species. A detailed description of the MIPAS-B2 spectrometer is given in Friedl-Vallon et al. (2004). The limb-sounding observations acquired during the ENVISAT validation flights were processed using a least squares fitting algorithm based on the forward model KOPRA (Karlsruhe Optimized and Precise Radiative transfer Algorithm) together with a Tikhonov-Phillips regularisation procedure (Höpfner et al., 2002). A total of 34 ozone microwindows have been chosen in the mid-infrared spectral region to infer vertical ozone profiles from the measured spectra. The resulting vertical resolution of the profiles lies typically between 2 and 3 km and is therefore compara-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1 I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

ble to MIPAS. The error estimation includes random noise, temperature errors, line of sight inaccuracies, and spectroscopic data errors. A detailed description of the level 2 MIPAS-B2 data analysis is given in [Wetzel et al. \(2006\)](#) and references therein. Table 5 provides an overview of the coincidences used in this paper for the comparison between MIPAS-B2 and MIPAS-ENVISAT ozone measurements. For MIPAS-B2 flights 11 and 13, a close to perfect coincidence with MIPAS-ENVISAT could be reached in time and space. For flight 14, this is true only for the coincidence in space while the time difference amounts several hours. However, both observations were carried out in the same air mass. We used exclusively MIPAS-ENVISAT ozone data version 4.61 for our comparison.

### 5.1.2 Results

In Fig. 9, we present the results of the comparison between all the available pairs of  $O_3$  matching profiles listed in Table 5. Each panel shows on the left side the MIPAS-ENVISAT and MIPAS-B2 ozone VMR profiles, retrieved from the coincident limb scanning sequences and on the right their absolute difference with over-plotted combined random and total errors. The MIPAS-B2 measurements have been cross checked with ozone sondes launched shortly after the launch of the MIPAS-B2 instrument. These comparisons have shown a general good agreement between MIPAS-B2 and the sondes (see, e.g., [Wetzel et al., 2006](#)). In general, an excellent agreement is obtained both for the mid-latitude as well as for the high latitude measurements over the whole range of vertical overlap, with significant discrepancies occasionally observed at the lowest levels (below  $\sim 100$  hPa) or in proximity of the peak of the  $O_3$  vertical distribution (above  $\sim 10$  hPa, where MIPAS-ENVISAT overestimates the ozone content). The absolute difference between MIPAS-ENVISAT and MIPAS-B2 ozone values is mostly within the combined total error, often remaining below its random component. An overall statistics of the comparison, showing mean profiles of the  $O_3$  absolute difference and corresponding total, random and systematic errors is displayed in Fig. 10. Average values have been calculated over all the pairs of coincident profiles: the mean abso-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

lute difference is shown (solid red line), along with the standard error of the mean (error bars). A bias between MIPAS-ENVISAT and MIPAS-B2 ozone values, that is marginally higher than the combined systematic errors, is only observed, at some pressure level, below 100 hPa. Moreover, the standard deviation never exceeds the combined random error value, except for a few levels above 10 hPa.

## 5.2 FIRS-2 and IBEX

### 5.2.1 Balloon-borne FT-FIR measurements and comparison methodology

Two balloon-borne high resolution Fourier transform Far-Infrared (FT-FIR) spectrometers were deployed in field campaigns for the validation of the ENVISAT chemistry payload: the Far InfraRed Spectrometer (FIRS-2) of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA, USA (Johnson et al., 1995) and the Infrared Balloon Experiment (IBEX) operated by the Institute for Applied Physics “Nello Carrara” (IFAC-CNR), Firenze, Italy (Bianchini et al., 2006). The FIRS-2 and IBEX instruments are capable of retrieving the vertical distributions of a number of trace gases from float altitude (approximately 35–40 km) down to the tropopause, with vertical resolutions of  $\sim 2$ –3 km, from limb sounding observations of the atmospheric emission spectrum. FIRS-2 measurements cover the spectral region of 80 to  $1220\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , while IBEX operates in photon noise limited conditions and acquires spectra in narrow bands (typically  $2\text{ cm}^{-1}$  wide) within the interval  $10$ – $250\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . FIRS-2 observations of  $\text{O}_3$  concentrations use transitions both in the rotational band between 80 and  $130\text{ cm}^{-1}$  and the  $\nu_2$  band between 730 and  $800\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The former lend the most weight above 25 km, while the latter contributes almost entirely below 20 km. In this section we compare MIPAS  $\text{O}_3$  data v4.61 with the ozone profiles retrieved from FIRS-2 measurements during flights from the National Scientific Balloon Facility balloon launch site at Fort Sumner, NM, USA (Lat.  $34^\circ\text{ N}$ , Lon.  $104^\circ\text{ W}$ ) on 20 October 2002 and on 19–20 July 2003 and with those obtained by IBEX in the trans-Mediterranean flight from Trapani, Italy (Lat.  $38^\circ\text{ N}$ , Lon.  $12^\circ\text{ E}$ ) to Spain on 29–30 July 2002. In both cases, useful co-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

incidences between MIPAS observations and measurements of the two FT-FIR spectrometers could be obtained only after substantial relaxation of the spatial-temporal matching criteria, as shown for instance in previous analyses carried out for MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> validation (Cortesi et al., 2004). No matching pair is available for comparison, if we

5 apply our baseline criteria for maximum temporal and spatial separation. As a consequence, we decided in the current work to exploit the two sets of correlative balloon data, using a Trajectory Hunting Technique (THT) (Danilin et al., 2002) that launches backward and forward trajectories from the locations of measurements and finds air parcels sampled at least twice within a prescribed match criterion during the course of

10 several days. A similar procedure was applied for comparison of MIPAS ozone profiles with both FIRS-2 and IBEX measurements, relying on isentropic trajectories calculated using the University of L'Aquila Global Trajectory Model (Redaelli, 1997; Dragani et al., 2002), on the base of ECMWF meteorological fields. Four days backward and forward isentropic trajectories, departing from the geolocations of FIRS-2 and IBEX

15 retrieved profiles were calculated and MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> profiles at locations within 2 degrees in longitude, 2 degrees in latitude and 2 hours in time along these trajectories were identified and vertically interpolated in Potential Temperature, to obtain the O<sub>3</sub> volume mixing ratio value to be compared with the corresponding FT-FIR measurements. The resulting comparison pairs were then binned by altitude, in steps of  $\Delta h = 1.5$  km and

20 averaged, and 1 $\sigma$  RMS values of the differences (MIPAS – FT-FIR data) in O<sub>3</sub> volume mixing ratios were calculated. Preliminary results of a so called “self-hunting” analyses of MIPAS data that matches satellite observation with themselves, providing a test for the precision of the instrument products and the quality of the calculated trajectories and thus assessing the noise in the technique and providing estimates to its possible

25 extension to multi-platform comparison for the selected time period, can be found in Taddei et al. (2006).

MIPAS ozone  
validation

U. Cortesi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## 5.2.2 Results of the comparison with FIRS-2 O<sub>3</sub> data

Results of the comparison between MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> measurements and data from the FIRS-2 flights on 20 October 2002 and on 19–20 July 2003 are shown in Fig. 11. Mean absolute and relative differences between MIPAS v4.61 and FIRS-2 O<sub>3</sub> VMR calculated with THT and binned by altitude values ( $\Delta h=1.5$  km) are displayed on the left and right panel, respectively;  $1\sigma$  error bars and total number of reconstructed data in each bin are also indicated. Very good agreement within  $1\sigma$  error bars, with relative differences within  $\pm 10\%$ , is found down to about 24 km. At lower levels the mean relative difference increases, mainly resulting from the small values of ozone mixing ratio at these altitudes, although the absolute difference remains reasonably small.

## 5.2.3 Results of the comparison with IBEX O<sub>3</sub> data

Mean absolute and relative differences between MIPAS v4.61 and IBEX O<sub>3</sub> data obtained during the trans-Mediterranean flight of 29–30 July 2002 are presented in Fig. 12. MIPAS measurements agree reasonably well with the balloon profile down to approximately 27 km (mean relative differences within  $\pm 10\%$ ). At lower altitudes, MIPAS appears to underestimate the ozone content by up to 30–40% with respect to IBEX

## 5.3 SPIRALE

### 5.3.1 SPIRALE data and comparison methodology

SPIRALE (SPectroscopie InfraRouge par Absorption de Lasers Embarqués) is a balloon-borne instrument operated by LPCE-CNRS (Laboratoire de Physique et Chimie de l'Environnement, Orléans, France) and employing the technique of tunable diode laser absorption spectroscopy to perform simultaneous in situ measurements of several minor atmospheric constituents (Moreau et al., 2005). The instrument, contributed to the ESABC programme with a mid-latitude and with a high latitude flight,

ACPD

7, 5805–5939, 2007

MIPAS ozone  
validation

U. Cortesi et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

11

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

EGU

carried out, respectively, from Aire sur l'Adour on 2 October 2002 and from Kiruna on 21 January 2003 to measure  $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{CO}$ ,  $\text{NO}$ ,  $\text{NO}_2$ ,  $\text{HNO}_3$  and  $\text{HCl}$  VMR profiles. MIPAS ozone data versions 4.61 and 4.62 have been compared with SPIRALE  $\text{O}_3$  profiles obtained during the descent phases of the October 2002 flight and during the ascent phase of the January 2003 flight. For the Arctic flight, direct coincidences with two MIPAS scans (orbit 4677, scan 20, v4.62 and orbit 4678, scan 6, v4.61), whose temporal separation from the SPIRALE measurements satisfied the baseline matching criterion  $\Delta t < 3\text{ h}$ , were available. The location of this flight was close to the vortex edge and although the spatial separation does not satisfy the baseline criterion  $\Delta s < 300\text{ km}$  (300–500 km for scan 20, 600–800 km for scan 6), MIPAS and SPIRALE measurements were made at locations close in PV (5 to 25% for scan 20, 5 to 35% for scan 6). Direct coincidences were not possible in the case of the mid-latitude flight. For the latter, the comparison was carried out, by means of trajectory analysis with MIPAS profiles from orbit 3019, scans 14 and 15 (v4.61) on 27 September at 23:52:50 UT and 23:54:11 UT respectively.

Estimations of the uncertainties on SPIRALE measurements have been previously described in detail (Moreau et al., 2005). In brief, random errors mainly come from the signal-to-noise ratio and from fluctuations of the laser emission signal, which have more important effects at lower altitudes (6% below 18 km) than at higher altitudes (2%). Systematic errors originate from the laser line width (increasing from 1% at lower altitudes to 3% at higher altitudes) and the spectroscopic parameters which are well determined (5%) at the used wave numbers ( $2081.7\text{--}2082.5\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ). Adding quadratically the random errors and the systematic errors results in total uncertainties of 6% at altitudes above 18 km ( $p < 80\text{ hPa}$ ) and 8% below 18 km ( $> 80\text{ hPa}$ ). MIPAS systematic errors have been computed by the Oxford University: Polar winter night time conditions and day and night mid-latitude conditions have been used, respectively, for the Arctic case and the mid-latitude case.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

### 5.3.2 Results of direct comparison

In Fig. 13, the  $O_3$  profile obtained by SPIRALE during the Kiruna 2003 flight is compared with coincident MIPAS  $O_3$  profiles from orbit 4678, scan 6 and from orbit 4677, scan 20. Both the SPIRALE original high vertical resolution profile and its smoothed version after the application of MIPAS averaging kernels are displayed. In general, a good agreement is observed in both cases, with MIPAS  $O_3$  data from orbit 4677, scan 20 mostly matching SPIRALE smoothed values within the error bars (with the only notable exception of the level above 100 hPa, where MIPAS  $O_3$  is closer to SPIRALE raw data). Slightly larger discrepancies are found in the comparison with MIPAS orbit 4678, scan 6, possibly due to increased comparison errors introduced by the greater spatial separation (600–800 km, PV differences up to 35%).

### 5.3.3 Results of trajectory-based comparison

The feasibility of using long trajectories for MIPAS validation by comparison with data of the SPIRALE flight on 2 October 2002 at Aire sur l'Adour was investigated by means of a PV analysis of sets of trajectories ending close to each point of the SPIRALE profile. For each point of the SPIRALE profile (with potential temperature steps of  $\Delta\Theta = 25$  K), seven backward trajectories have been calculated:

- the trajectory ending at the point of the SPIRALE profile;
- four trajectories ending close to this point on the same isentropic surface ( $\pm 0.5^\circ$  in latitude and  $\pm 0.5^\circ$  in longitude);
- two trajectories ending  $\pm 6.25$  K (about 250 m) above and below the point of the SPIRALE profile.

For each trajectory, PV at 00:00 UT on 28 September has then been computed, along with mean PV and standard deviation for each set of 7 trajectories. Finally, we calcu-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

lated the difference between the mean value and the PV at the end of the trajectories (SPIRALE profile) as a function of potential temperature.

We found that between 400 K and 600 K and between 700 K and 900 K, standard deviation is very low (<2–3%) and PV is conserved relatively well on the 4.5 days trajectories (the differences are less than 10%). This is not the case below 400 K, between 600 K and 700 K and above 900 K. Air masses mixing probably occurs on these isentropic surfaces. SPIRALE data are therefore no longer representative of the measurements made by MIPAS on the same isentropic surface. Moreover, by comparing the PV values of SPIRALE and MIPAS profiles, we found that PV differences are lower than 10% between 400 K and 600 K for both profiles and above 700 K for profile 14. We conclude, therefore, that SPIRALE data may be used to validate:

- MIPAS profile 14 of orbit 3019 on the potential surfaces between 400 K and 600 K and between 700 K and 900 K, which corresponds to the retrieval nominal MIPAS altitudes 18, 21, 24, 30 and 33 km;
- MIPAS profile 15 of orbit 3019 on the potential surfaces between 400 K and 600 K, which corresponds to the nominal MIPAS altitudes: 18, 21 and 24 km

The results of the comparison are shown in Fig. 14, highlighting an almost perfect overlapping between MIPAS and SPIRALE O<sub>3</sub> measurements.

## 5.4 MIPAS-STR, SAFIRE-A and FOZAN on-board the M-55 Geophysica aircraft

### 5.4.1 Ozone data of the M-55 Geophysica remote-sensing and in situ payload

Simultaneous measurements of the ozone vertical distribution in strict coincidence with MIPAS-ENVISAT overpasses were obtained by the in situ and remote-sensing instruments of the M-55 Geophysica high altitude aircraft during dedicated flights at mid-latitude (Forlì, Italy, July and October 2002) and in the Arctic region (Kiruna, Sweden, February–March 2003), aiming at the validation of the satellite chemistry sensors, as reported in details by Cortesi et al. (2004). The remote-sensing payload

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⌂

⌂

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



embarked aboard the M-55 stratospheric platform during these missions consisted of two FT spectrometers operating in limb sounding geometry and capable of retrieving the ozone VMR profile from the upper troposphere up to the stratospheric altitude and the total ozone column above: MIPAS-STR (MIPAS STRatospheric aircraft, FZK-IMK, Karlsruhe, Germany) and SAFIRE-A (Spectroscopy of the Atmosphere by using Far-InfraRed Emission – Airborne, IFAC-CNR, Firenze, Italy). MIPAS-STR is an aircraft version of the satellite spectrometer and operates in the middle infrared spectral region with similar characteristics and performances (Piesch et al., 1996). SAFIRE-A is a high-resolution FT instrument, performing limb emission measurements in narrow bands ( $\Delta s \sim 1\text{--}2\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) within the far-infrared spectral region ( $10\text{--}250\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ), as described in Bianchini et al. (2004). Both instruments obtain ozone profiles with a vertical resolution (approximately  $1\text{--}2\text{ km}$ ) that is slightly better, but still comparable with the one of MIPAS-ENVISAT v4.61/v4.62 data and are, therefore, directly compared with the satellite measurements without correcting for the vertical smoothing effects.

The chemiluminescent ozone sonde FOZAN (Fast OZone ANalyzer), jointly operated by ISAC-CNR (Bologna, Italy) and CAO (Central Aerological Observatory, Moscow, Russia) teams, provides in situ measurements of the ozone concentration at stratospheric altitude (Yushkov et al., 1999) with a sampling rate of  $1\text{ Hz}$  and precision and accuracy equal to  $8\%$  and  $0.01\text{ ppmv}$  respectively. High resolution vertical profiles (typically, a vertical resolution of about  $10\text{ m}$  is obtained during ascent and descent phases of the flight) of  $\text{O}_3$  are reconstructed from FOZAN measurements acquired during take-off and landing, as well as during occasional dives performed by the aircraft close to the geolocation of MIPAS-ENVISAT scans. MIPAS averaging kernels are applied to FOZAN high resolution  $\text{O}_3$  data to obtain the smoothed profile to be compared with the satellite retrieved values. We report results of our comparison based on the use of both the high resolution and smoothed FOZAN data.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## 5.4.2 Comparison methodology

A total of 11 flights and about 45 flight hours was performed with the M-55 Geophysica for the validation of the ENVISAT chemistry payload in the frame of the 2002–2003 ESABC field campaigns. The results of these airborne measurements have been stored and are now accessible at the ENVISAT Cal/Val database of the Norwegian Institute for Air Research (NILU, <http://nadir.nilu.no/calval/>). Using these data, multiple coincidences can be identified – based on the agreed matching criteria ( $\Delta s < 300$  km,  $\Delta t < 3$  h) – between MIPAS-ENVISAT and the remote-sensing and in situ aircraft observations, thus obtaining a comprehensive set of collocated  $O_3$  profiles to be considered for validation purposes. Here, we have selected a sub-set of the above comparison pairs including only those flights for which at least two sensors of the M-55 Geophysica payload provided useful ozone measurements (for mutual data quality check) and choosing, for each MIPAS scan, the  $O_3$  profiles measured with the best spatial and temporal coincidence by MIPAS-STR, SAFIRE-A and FOZAN. The resulting validation data set is shown in Table 6, illustrating the combinations of MIPAS-ENVISAT, MIPAS-STR, SAFIRE-A and FOZAN profiles that have been used for our comparison. All the comparisons with correlative data provided by the M-55 Geophysica payload have been carried out using MIPAS-ENVISAT data v4.61. In the case of the aircraft remote-sensing measurements, we have compared the  $O_3$  vertical distribution retrieved from the individual MIPAS-ENVISAT scans with the mean VMR profile of MIPAS-STR (or SAFIRE-A) obtained by averaging over all the limb scanning sequences collocated with the selected satellite overpass. SAFIRE-A mean profiles have been calculated over fixed pressure levels, corresponding approximately to a regular altitude grid with steps of 1.0 km. MIPAS-STR  $O_3$  profiles have been retrieved on a fixed altitude grid. The VMRs of one altitude have been averaged to get the mean profile (Höpfner et al., 2001; Keim et al., 2004). The UTC time interval covered by SAFIRE-A and MIPAS-STR averages is indicated in Table 6. Total error budget estimates are reported for both instruments, combining the random error contributions (measurement noise and

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

retrieval error) and the systematic uncertainties. For the mean MIPAS-STR profiles three sources dominate the error budget. The detector noise in the individual spectra leads to about 2% ( $1\sigma$ ) in a single profile. This is in good agreement with the standard deviation of the average. The second error source is connected to the use of HITRAN spectral line data for the radiative transfer calculation in the forward model. This error is estimated to be below 10%. The third error stems from the retrieved temperatures used to obtain the trace gases. A temperature error of 2 K results in an upper limit VMR error for  $O_3$  of  $<10\%$ . Effects such as non-LTE, uncertainties in the pointing of the instrument, horizontal atmospheric inhomogeneity along the line of sight can cause further errors, which were considered of minor importance. As the three dominating error sources are independent they sum up to below 14%. The estimate of the systematic error in SAFIRE-A ozone profiles takes into account the contribution of the assumed pressure and temperature profile ( $\sim 2\%$ ) and the spectroscopic error ( $\sim 5\%$ ).

In situ vertical profiles, measured by FOZAN during ascent or descent phases of the flight, are compared with collocated MIPAS-ENVISAT measurements and with the remote-sensing data recorded on-board the aircraft when flying at level (flight altitude between 17 and 20 km) immediately before/after the M-55 ascent/descent. As previously stated, the comparison is made using both high vertical resolution in situ data and the smoothed profile obtained by convolution with MIPAS averaging kernels.

The comparisons cover the altitude range between  $\sim 25$  km (slightly above the maximum flight altitude) and MIPAS-ENVISAT lowest tangent altitude. The aircraft measurements conducted in the polar region aimed at validating MIPAS-ENVISAT products in presence of strong vertical and horizontal gradients. Consequently, the corresponding data set (February–March 2003 data) generally includes data acquired at the border of the polar vortex, with vertical and horizontal inhomogeneities much larger than those encountered at mid-latitude (July and October 2002 data). To avoid strong gradients along the line of sight of the remote sensing instruments, which decrease the quality of the measured profiles, the flights were planned with long north south legs. The aircraft measurements have been performed in west east direction, while the MIPAS-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

ENVISAT measured north south along the gradients. Very high quality coincidences, both in the spatial and in the temporal domain, characterize the correlative data set available from the M-55 Geophysica campaigns; particularly for the remote-sensing measurements, considering that the time difference between MIPAS-STR/SAFIRE-A and MIPAS-ENVISAT is on average less than 1 h (see Table 6).

#### 5.4.3 Comparison results

Results of the comparison between MIPAS-ENVISAT ozone profiles and the M-55 correlative measurements obtained during Northern mid-latitude flights (Forlì, Italy, 22 July 2002 and 24 October 2002) and during the Arctic campaign (Kiruna, Sweden, 2 March 2003 and 12 March 2003) are shown in Fig. 15 and Fig. 16, respectively. Each plot displays the ozone vertical distribution retrieved by MIPAS-ENVISAT for one of the selected overpasses and the collocated O<sub>3</sub> profiles measured by the remote-sensing and in situ sensors of the aircraft. Ozone VMR values are plotted versus pressure, in a range roughly corresponding to the 6–25 km interval, as indicated by the approximate altitude scale reported on the right axis of the plots. The error bars on MIPAS-ENVISAT, MIPAS-STR and SAFIRE-A profiles indicate the total uncertainty on the corresponding ozone values.

Very good agreement is found at mid-latitude, with aircraft O<sub>3</sub> measurements and satellite data generally matching within their total error bars (with the only exception of the MIPAS-ENVISAT orbit 2051/scan 12, that overestimates the O<sub>3</sub> VMR below 100 hPa compared to MIPAS-STR, still matching, however, the in situ measurements acquired by FOZAN during landing). Reasonably good results are found, on the other hand, also from the comparison of the ozone profiles from the Arctic flights, despite the larger atmospheric inhomogeneities that characterize the measurement scenario at higher latitudes. The occurrence of strong vertical gradients is highlighted in the comparison with in situ measurements (see, for instance, plots of MIPAS-ENVISAT orbit 5250/scan 19 and orbit 5386/scan 29) and can account for the observed differences with remote-sensing data, whilst horizontal gradients encountered at the border of the

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

1I

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

polar vortex might at least partially justify the discrepancy in ozone values retrieved by the airborne and satellite limb-sounders. We can notice from Fig. 16, that MIPAS-ENVISAT normally tends to be in a very good agreement with MIPAS-STR and only occasionally to show significant differences, mostly in terms of a slight overestimate of the ozone VMR. The latter trend is more pronounced in comparison with SAFIRE-A mean profiles, that are almost consistently lower MIPAS-ENVISAT O<sub>3</sub> values.

In order to investigate the origin of the observed differences, we must remember that our selection of collocated ozone profiles was based on standard criteria for the maximum separation, in space and in time, between pairs of satellite and aircraft measurements and did not take into account any further requirement for the proximity of the observed air masses. This implies, for observation performed across strong vertical and horizontal gradients, that matching measurements, satisfying the spatial and temporal coincidence criteria, can be associated with substantially different conditions and thus explain the observed discrepancy between ozone mixing ratio retrieved from airborne and satellite data.

We can look, for instance, at the Potential Vorticity field on the isentropic surface  $\Theta = 420$  K (approximately 18 km) in the region covered by the M-55 flight on 12 March 2003 (from NCEP data at 12:00 UTC), as displayed in the map of Fig. 17. And we can notice the geolocation of a particular set of collocated measurements from MIPAS-ENVISAT (orbit 5386—scan 28), MIPAS-STR (scans 31–36) and SAFIRE-A (scans 9–14): MIPAS-ENVISAT and MIPAS-STR limb measurements mostly overlap on a region with PV values of about  $(25 \pm 1)$  pvu, whilst SAFIRE-A mean profile results from averaging over a more extended area including air masses with PV values as high as  $\sim 30$  pvu. In the plot of Fig. 16, we observe, correspondingly, matching ozone values retrieved at 18 km by MIPAS-ENVISAT and MIPAS-STR (approximately 1.8–2.0 ppmv) and lower O<sub>3</sub> VMR measured by SAFIRE-A (approximately 1.6 ppmv). This example, as well as similar checks performed using different combinations of coincident data, confirm that whenever a significant difference is found between simultaneous ozone measurements of MIPAS and one of the M-55 Geophysica sensors this is mostly due to sampling of

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

different air masses across a region of strong horizontal (and vertical) gradients. A more comprehensive and quantitative analysis of the O<sub>3</sub> differences in the (PV,  $\Theta$ ) space is currently in progress (Redaelli et al., 2006), based on the entire O<sub>3</sub> data set available from the SAFIRE-A/ENVISAT validation campaigns and will be presented in a dedicated paper.

## 5.5 ASUR

### 5.5.1 ASUR data and methodology of the comparison

Measurements of the ozone VMR profiles gathered by the Airborne Sub-millimetre Radiometer ASUR (Mees et al., 1995) during the SCIAMACHY Validation and Utilization Experiment SCIAVALUE (Fix et al., 2005) are used in this study to validate MIPAS ozone data products v4.61. ASUR is a passive heterodyne radiometer for middle atmospheric sounding, operating in the frequency range 604–662 GHz and flying on-board an aircraft to avoid signal absorption due to tropospheric water vapour. Mixing ratio profiles of stratospheric trace gases O<sub>3</sub>, ClO, HCl, HNO<sub>3</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, etc. are retrieved on a 2 km altitude grid using the optimal estimation method (Rodgers, 1990). The retrieved ozone profiles from 16 km to 50 km have a vertical resolution of 7–10 km, decreasing with altitude and a horizontal resolution of about 20 km. An error in instrument calibration led to systematically high values in earlier ASUR publications. This error has been rectified for this paper, and the measurement accuracy is now better than 10% (Kuttippurath et al., 2007). We compared the collocated ozone profiles obtained by MIPAS and ASUR within the baseline coincidence criteria  $\Delta s < 300$  km and  $\Delta t < 3$  h. The MIPAS ozone profiles were convoluted with the ASUR averaging kernels, to account for the lower vertical resolution of the ASUR measurements. The smoothed MIPAS values were used to calculate the absolute and relative differences with the collocated ASUR measurements. Mean profiles of the differences were finally obtained by averaging over the available coincidences in different latitude bands (the tropics, Mid-latitude and the Arctic).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1

1

2

1

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## 5.5.2 Results

Mean profiles of the absolute difference between ASUR and MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> VMR and of their relative difference with respect to the ASUR values, calculated from the available data set of direct coincidences, are reported in Fig. 18 for three latitude bands, corresponding to the tropics (5° S–30° N), mid-latitude (30° N–60° N), and the Arctic (60° N–80° N), as well as for all of these regions combined. Both the absolute and relative differences are plotted as a function of altitude, with an approximate pressure scale derived from the US Standard Atmosphere displayed on the right axis. The yellow shaded area represents the 1 $\sigma$  standard deviation from the mean profile. The total number of coincidences is 50 with the majority, 22 instances, in the Arctic, 7 instances in mid-latitudes, and 21 instances in the tropics. The MIPAS-ASUR deviation is –0.9 to +0.4 ppmv or –40 to +4% in the Tropics at 20–40 km, whereas at mid-latitudes the difference is within 0.9 ppmv or –15 to +25%. The agreement between the profiles is very good in the Arctic between 20 and 40 km, where the difference is within  $\pm 0.4$  ppmv or –6 to +4%.

## 6 Comparison with satellite measurements

Correlative measurements of the ozone vertical distribution are obtained by several satellite sensors operating simultaneously with the MIPAS-ENVISAT spectrometer and employing different observation modes. In this section we check the validity of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> data against coincident profiles retrieved by four solar occultation instruments (SAGE II, HALOE, POAM III and ACE), by a nadir-viewing sensor (GOME) and by a limb-emission sounder (ODIN-SMR).

A common strategy was followed for the validation of MIPAS O<sub>3</sub> profiles by comparison with these space-borne sensors, using the key concepts of the scheme for statistical bias and precision determination with matching pairs of measurements described in Von Clarmann (2006) and based on the comparison:

(a) between the mean percentage difference (MIPAS-REFERENCE) O<sub>3</sub> VMR and the

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



combined systematic error of the two instruments, in order to identify unexplained biases in MIPAS ozone measurements

(b) between the standard deviation of the mean relative difference and the combined random error, in order to validate the precision of MIPAS.

5 Details of the procedure for the implementation of this scheme were agreed and slightly adapted in the individual cases, to better exploit the specific features of each data set. Unless otherwise noted, the standard criteria for maximum space and time separation of 300 km and 3 h with the reference measurements were strictly applied, to select the comparison pairs available during the overlapping period of operation of MIPAS and  
10 the validating instrument.

For each of the selected pairs, both MIPAS and the reference instrument O<sub>3</sub> profiles were interpolated on a common pressure grid, to enable a statistical analysis of collocated measurements having different vertical resolutions: the interpolation grid was generally defined by averaging the pressure values of the selected MIPAS scans  
15 (details about interpolation of O<sub>3</sub> vertical profiles are provided in the relevant subsections, whenever a different choice has been made, like for instance in the case of MIPAS/POAM comparison). With the only exception of the comparison with the GOME observations, no averaging kernels have been applied, because of the similar vertical resolution of MIPAS and the reference instruments.

20 The interpolated profiles were used to calculate the relative deviation, RD, in ozone VMR values retrieved by MIPAS and by the correlative sensor at each pressure level (p) using Eq. (17):

$$RD(p) = 100 \times \frac{\text{MIPAS}[\text{O}_3]_p - \text{REFERENCE}[\text{O}_3]_p}{\text{REFERENCE}[\text{O}_3]_p} \quad (17)$$

25 The mean relative deviation (MRD) and root mean square (RMS) of the relative deviation between all MIPAS and correlative sensor pairs were determined, along with corresponding quantities averaged over subsets of latitudinal or seasonal bands, whenever



further investigation was required to isolate the source of discrepancies identified in the global average or to diagnose zonal and seasonal patterns in the O<sub>3</sub> mean differences.

In all cases, beside the MRD over all the available coincidences, mean profiles of both MIPAS and the reference instrument are displayed in the plots of the global average.

Combined random and systematic error estimates on the O<sub>3</sub> VMR difference between matching profiles were based on the expected uncertainties of MIPAS measurements and on validated precision and accuracy of the correlative data.

As far as MIPAS errors are concerned, we refer, in general, to the ESA level 2 products for the random error due to propagation of the instrument noise through the retrieval and to the climatological estimate of systematic errors provided by University of Oxford.

An important point we made, to properly evaluate the combined error budget associated with the mean relative difference of collocated O<sub>3</sub> profiles, is that some of the components, listed in the Oxford University data set as systematic error on the individual profiles, show a random variability over the longer time-scale involved when averaging different MIPAS scans and/or orbits and tend to contribute to the standard deviation of the mean difference rather than to the bias. Taking this into account, for the purpose of our comparisons with concurrent satellite sensors, we have considered the error contribution due to propagation of pressure and temperature (pT) random covariance into the retrieval of O<sub>3</sub> VMR (taken from the Oxford Univ. data set) as a randomly variable component and combined it with the measurement noise – using the root-sums-square method – to obtain MIPAS random error. MIPAS systematic error was conversely calculated by subtracting the pT propagation error from the overall systematic error given in the Oxford Univ. profiles.

In the following sub-sections, details of individual comparison with the above listed satellite sensors are provided. A very brief description of the instrument and of the correlative data set is given in each case, specifying the data version adopted for the comparison with MIPAS v4.61 and/or v4.62 profiles and referring to the most recent

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

1J

11

J

I

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion